

From: Eric Graybill/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
Sent: 1/11/2012 12:22:44 PM
To: Stevie Wilding/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
CC: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Kevin Martin/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; kevin Poff/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: Fw: Dimock RLs

My take

So I know Kevin has run the SIM method for PAHs for the Smith River (sitting on my desk for me to review). I guess my question is what levels do they really want. I mean if we could do 0.1 ug/L but they need 0.0029 ug/L I don't think we have really accomplished that much. I will try to look for this document he is talking about but the first link I clicked on wasn't good. Then my computer security needed to reboot and I decided to send a response. Could he send what the levels he wants are?

Either way we cannot do two extractions because of the amount of time, glass ware, and space it would take. Possibly we could ignore surrogate recoveries in SIM mode (will know recovery at the normal level following analysis for the SVOC at 5 ug/L), and because of the need for different ISTD concentrations split the samples in half where half goes to SVOC at 5 ug/L and the other to SIM or TOF at ~0.1 ug/L (or what level they need).

Or Book it out??

Eric Graybill
EPA Region III
Ft. Meade MD
410-305-2665

It's a cardinal rule to be generous in a democracy...The Good Shepherd (movie 2006)

From: Stevie Wilding/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
To: Eric Graybill/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, kevin Poff/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Kevin Martin/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 01/11/2012 09:15 AM
Subject: Fw: Dimock RLs

Eric/Kevin P,

See Gene Nance's message below. We may need to do PAH via SIM or TOF.

----- Forwarded by Stevie Wilding/ESC/R3/USEPA/US on 01/11/2012 09:13 AM -----

From: "Nance, Gene" <Gnance@TechLawInc.com>
To: Stevie Wilding/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
Date: 01/10/2012 08:07 PM
Subject: Dimock RLs

Stevie,

I reviewed the RLs list. We don't have any assigned site-specific action limits, but I just compared with the Safe drinking water act MCLs and the RPA Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) if no MCL was published. I didn't have time to look up many of the compounds, but my findings follow: All the metals RLs were at or below the MCLs. I only looked up some of the SVOCs. I believe the OLC03.2 CRQLs are adequate for the phthalates, which are some of the site-specific

contaminants. But a significant number of the PAH compounds have very low RSLs, some below 1 ug/l. (I think benzo(a)pyrene has an RSL ~ 0.0029 ug/l for tap water). I don't know if the PAHs have been detected at the site, but the RP had their samples analyzed by what they called '8270W', evidently a variation of the SW846 SVOC method, and had a 1.0 ug/l RL (PQL). When we had a similar Marcellus Shale-related site last summer, we had the lab do the PAHs by 8270C SIM, which had a 0.1 ug/L RL for the PAHs included in the TCL. I didn't have time to check the VOCs, but from previous projects, I believe virtually all the OLC03.2 CRQLs are at or near the MCLs/RSLs.

This is just FYI. The PM has asked one of the OSCs if they have action levels or standards that the data will be compared with, but we haven't received any to date.

Gene Nance
TechLaw, Inc.
740.867.0968 (office)
304.830.1442 (mobile)